

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
10/699,137	10/30/2003	Wendy Ng	A5701D1/T41510	3462
7	590 03/07/2005		EXAMINER	
Patent Counsel, M/S 2061			KACKAR, RAM N	
APPLIED MATERIALS, INC. Legal Affairs Department			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
P.O. Box 450A Santa Clara, CA 95052			1763	
			DATE MAILED: 03/07/2005	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

				// /				
		Application No.	Applicant(s)					
Office Action Summary		10/699,137	NG ET AL.					
		Examiner	Art Unit					
		Ram N Kackar	1763					
Period f	The MAILING DATE of this communication app or Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence addre	iss				
THE - Extended - If the - If NO - Failth - Any	MORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. ensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 or SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. e period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply operiod for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period we ure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing ned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be ti y within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) da vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS fror , cause the application to become ABANDON	mely filed ys will be considered timely. n the mailing date of this comm ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	unication.				
Status								
1) 🏻	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 De	ecember 2004.						
'=		action is non-final.						
3)□	, 							
,—	closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.							
Disposit	tion of Claims							
4)⊠	Claim(s) 6,8-12 and 17 is/are pending in the ap	onlication						
-,	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.							
5)□	Claim(s) is/are allowed.							
	⊠ Claim(s) <u>6,8-12and 17</u> is/are rejected.							
	☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to.							
	Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.							
Applicat	tion Papers							
9)	The specification is objected to by the Examine	r.		•				
	10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.							
<i>,</i> —	Applicant may not request that any objection to the							
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).							
11)[The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex							
	under 35 U.S.C. § 119							
12)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign All b) Some * c) None of:	priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).					
	1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.							
	2. Certified copies of the priority documents	s have been received in Applicat	ion No					
	3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior application from the International Bureau		ed in this National Sta	ige				
* 5	See the attached detailed Office action for a list of	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	ed.					
		•						
Λ#9eb=	,e(a)							
Attachmen	n(s) ce of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary	(PTO 412)					
	ce of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail D						
3) 🔲 Infori	mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) er No(s)/Mail Date	5) Notice of Informal I 6) Other:	Patent Application (PTO-15)	2)				

Application/Control Number: 10/699,137

Art Unit: 1763

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 6, 8-10, 12 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nonaka (JP 5-326457-A) in view of Moran (US Patent No. 5,986,747).

Nonaka teaches a processing chamber (Fig. 1) for a plasma-based semiconductor fabrication process and a method of using the same employing an endpoint detection device arranged in an exhaust line of the processing chamber, the method comprising:

Providing a *processing chamber* 1 configured to receive plasma species from a plasma source, the processing chamber including a *throttle valve* 6 configured to output an exhaust from the processing chamber;

Providing a *bypass foreline* 7 positioned downstream from the throttle valve 6; and Providing an *endpoint detection cell* 8 (abstract).

Nonaka fails to teach the bypass foreline including an *isolation valve* such that the endpoint detection cell positioned downstream from the isolation valve and selectively isolated from exposure to chamber exhaust by the isolation valve.

Moran teach an analysis chamber 422 (*endpoint detection cell*) arranged in an exhaust line 405 of a processing chamber 402 wherein the analysis chamber 422 (*endpoint detection cell*) is isolated form the exhaust line by a valve 426 for sampling process byproducts. The analysis chamber 422 (*endpoint detection cell*) comprising an excitation source 429 such as a cathode 131B and an anode 131A (Fig. 1) and an optical analyzer 438, wherein the valve 426, the excitation source 429 and the optical analyzer 438 are in communication with a system controller (column 5, line 55 through column 6, line 12 and column 3, lines 43-62). Moran teaches that the sampling of the by products begins after the process is started and the analysis of the by products is done even at a later stage (See program listing Fig 3-306 and 310)

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to implement the endpoint detection mechanism as taught by Moran in the apparatus of Nonaka in order to sample the processing byproducts for analysis and thus separate the excitation required for analysis from fabrication process in the processing chamber, thereby reducing unwanted signals and improving the signal to noise ratio for the signals being analyzed (column 6, lines 29-36).

Furthermore: Moran further teaches that the analysis chamber 422 (endpoint detection cell) comprising an excitation source 429 such as a cathode 131B and an anode 131A (Fig. 1) and an optical analyzer 438, wherein the valve 426, the excitation source 429 and the optical

Application/Control Number: 10/699,137

Art Unit: 1763

analyzer 438 are in communication with a system controller (column 5, line 55 through column 6, line 12 and column 3, lines 43-62).

Furthermore: the apparatus of Nonaka or Moran can be used as plasma enhanced chemical vapor deposition processing (column 2, lines 50-56-60 of Moran).

Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nonaka (JP 5-326457-A) in view of Moran (US Patent No. 5,986,747) as applied to claims 6 as above, and further in view of Williams et al (US Patent No. 5,472,561).

Nonaka in view of Moran teach all limitations of the claim as discussed above except for the endpoint detection cell including an RF power detector detecting an RF power of a plasma generated in the endpoint detection cell.

Williams et al teaches a plasma reactor 14 (Fig. 1) including a sensor 13 for monitoring voltage, current and phase angle of an RF signal coupled to the plasma reactor in order to control the plasma condition (abstract and column 3, lines 1-45).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to implement the RF power detection mechanism as taught by Williams et al in the apparatus of Nonaka in view of Moran in order to monitor and control the condition of plasma in the detection cell.

Response to Amendment

Applicant's arguments filed 12/20/2004 have been fully considered. They are persuasive to enable removing rejections on the basis of Sivaramakrishnan et al.

Application/Control Number: 10/699,137

Art Unit: 1763

However applicant's arguments in regards to Moran are not persuasive. Applicant argues that Moran does not disclose the selective exposure of detection cell to exhaust in a later stage of semiconductor fabrication process.

This is not correct since Moran clearly discloses that the sampling starts after several steps in the fabrication process are done like insert substrate and begin processing (Fig 3).

Moreover Moran suggests that the detection part is isolated from the fabrication process by the valve and <u>residence time</u> (Col 6 line 26) and discharge power can be adjusted to optimize the OES signal independent of the process. This also suggests that user could optimize when to start detection.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ram N Kackar whose telephone number is 571 272 1436. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:00 A.M to 5:P.M.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Parviz Hassanzadeh can be reached on 571 272 1435. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

∕✓ RK P. Hassanradel SPE, AV 1763